

10-1-2013

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fs](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fs)



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 1, 2013" (2013). *Finance and Service Committee Minutes*. Paper 2.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fs/2](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fs/2)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Finance and Service Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

## FINANCE AND SERVICE COMMITTEE

MINUTES: October 1, 2013

Approved: November 5, 2013

### Attending:

**Faculty: A&S:** Hoyt Edge, Susan Cohn Lackman, Paul Reich, Steve St. John; **Staff:** Steve Gauthier, Leon Hayner; **CPS:** NA; **Students:** Ruqayyah Ali, Mary Birthisel, Romulo Rainha; **Guests:** Bill Short (Asst. VP, Finance), Pat Schoknecht (F&S Sustainability Subcommittee)

Approval of Minutes from September 3, 2013, meeting.

### I. Change in Order of Business to Accommodate motion from Sustainability Subcommittee representative: Schoknecht presented draft Rollins College Idling Policy:

*Rationale:* Idling vehicles discharge toxic emissions that pollute the air we breathe. Unnecessary vehicle idling contributes to poor air quality and global climate change, decreasing both human and environmental health. Pollutants accumulate both inside of idling vehicles and outdoors near them. Exhaust from idling vehicles may be drawn into nearby building ventilation systems, affecting air quality indoors as well.

*Policy:* Therefore, Rollins College has adopted the policy that no vehicle may idle for more than two (2) minutes on campus.

All department heads whose employees drive Rollins College vehicles should enforce this policy through standard management practices. This policy should be attached to all contracts so that vendors are aware of this stipulation. We expect that vendors will voluntarily comply with this policy or risk not having their contracts renewed.

Campus locations where vehicles often idle will have signs posted that inform the driver of the two (2) minute idling restriction.

Discussion: The intent is that there are buses that idle for longer periods of time, as well as vendors; request contracts include statement that vehicles can't idle for more than two minutes. St. John questioned problems for delivery vans. Was this hypocritical? Should this also be enforced for Rollins College vehicles on RC business? Hayner: Hard to have a policy that can't be enforced. Lackman pointed out that in the Alford Lot large buses seem to idle for a very long time. St. John: could there be a problem with posting signs indicating "No Idling Zone"?

Schoknecht presented motion, which was seconded. Motion tabled to next meeting so we can discuss with our constituencies.

Note: The Sustainability Subcommittee needs a representative from F&S; Hayner will check schedule.

### II. Report by Edge on presentation to A&S Faculty Meeting, September 26, 2013:

- A. **Parking** – Because of changes in parking, for instance, the increase in the disability parking in the Sports Center lot, and the loss of spaces in the Lawrence Center lot as well as Alford Inn workers parking on the top floor of the parking garage, faculty were concerned about loss of parking spaces. At the same time that the disability parking spaces increased in the Sports Center Lot, the buses were taken out and are now parked behind McKean. Previously, disability parking was distributed around campus and often at physically challenging locations, and there was greater need around the Chapel/Theatre/Tiedtke area, so outlying spaces were regrouped into the Sports Center lot. Now that most contractors are gone, more spaces on campus have opened up, but there is still concern.

In terms of additional requirements for the Alford Inn, overflow valet parking may occur in off hours on the top floor of the Garage for now, but it is not used often. The good news is that over Christmas break and early January, three new lots will be paved. First, the All Saints lot will be paved by us so that we can use that lot for overflow Alford Inn parking and Alford Inn workers, taking all those out of the parking garage. Additionally, the College Arms lot will be expanded from 6 spaces to 35 spaces. More importantly, the Science Village space will be paved with the addition of some 80 spaces over and above the spaces now, so at the beginning or early in the spring semester, there will be an additional 100 spaces approximately on campus, plus the additional spaces reclaimed in the parking garage. Some of the new spaces will be dedicated to disability parking, some to faculty/staff, and some to general parking. So the outlook for parking improves beginning in the spring.

In terms of Parking there will be a net increase, Spring 2014 or thereabouts: 100 new spots created, including expansion of parking behind College Arms (30 spaces), Science Village, plus spots from top floor of garage because workers for Alford Inn are finishing up.

- B. **Faculty Travel Increases** – Beginning this year, \$250 has been added to the amount we can spend for professional travel domestically and internationally (to \$1450 and \$1750). This amount does not yet catch us up with the CPI since 1992, when \$1200 and \$1500 were set, but since there were additional funds left in the travel budget last year, the plan is to study how the increase affects faculty professional travel this year, and then revisit the issue. Thanks to Bob Moore and the committee last year for their good work on instituting this increase.
- C. **Study of salary inequities due to compression, and of gender inequity** – A study of these issues was begun last spring and the committee has just met, I understand, to continue that study. I met with Udeh Lugo, Institutional Researcher, to discuss both issues and the problems involved in the study, as well as to try to figure out how to get appropriate information out to the faculty about salaries. In the past we have been given a scatter plot, and this gave us most of the relevant information, given that our salary policy was based completely rank and years in rank. With the introduction of a market based salary policy and merit pay, the simple progression of salaries no longer holds, so a scatter plot like the ones we have received in the past will not give us as faculty much information, certainly not the type that we can evaluate compression and gender equity issues. The most sensitive approach would be to look at each faculty member's salary and try to find the most comparable person and compare the two salaries, and if there is a disparity to look into the history of each case to try to find out if there is good reason for the disparity. But, none of this information could be available to faculty since it deals with individual salaries and faculty members. So I asked the administrative committee not only to continue their study of compression and gender inequity, but to figure out the best approximation to the traditional scatter plots to be given faculty.
- D. **Merit Increase** – The recommendation of a committee of the Provost, the Deans, and the faculty on the Planning and Budget Committee and sent to the President is:

1. a fixed stipend to all faculty, to meet health care and other fixed rising costs, of about \$600; seamless and no application needed
2. the remainder (about \$768) to be given in merit after consideration of faculty's merit and following application/submission of required paperwork; deans would work with committees to assess merit; this will probably be given as a % of salary
3. if the budget hole is fixed, this stipend plus merit becomes permanent effective in Sept 14
4. the following year, Finance plans to try to build a 2% raise into the budget

**Merit Pay:** – 2% increase for Faculty and Staff: \$600 flat rate, then then look and see how much is needed. If the form is sent in and faculty are judged meritorious, faculty will be brought up to 2%. Any left is distributed to lower end to make up for rising costs. Payment will occur in one lump sum. Everyone will get 2%, with any leftover going to lower income employees. This one-time payment will not be part of benefits, retirement, et al. 2% is \$1.3 million. The College still has upward pressure on expenses. To a question of the Merit Pay Subcommittee, Edge noted a conversation was in process and last year a report was made to F&S.

- E. **Promotion increases** – We have requested the administration and the Planning and Budget Committee to increase the promotion bumps to Associate Professor to \$3500 and the Full Professor to \$6000; this request has been approved by the administration and will go into effect in next year's budget.

Administration has agreed that the one-time bump for rising to Assoc. Prof will go up to \$3500. Salary compression is an issue, a mixture of when a faculty member is hired, also when there is promotion. Edge speaking with Udeh Lugo for research on salary compression; they are beginning discussion on compression and gender equity. Six years ago salary policy changed to become completely market-based; traditionally salaries were easier to plot on a chart to enable faculty to see compression and gender inequity instead of now that we have market-based salaries. What sort of analysis would make sense for faculty to receive to get clear information? Short responded: Last year HR (Maria Martinez) has CUPA data for salaries; Martinez studied gender equity, but doesn't see an issue with that. Re compression: Provost Bresnahan will work with Matt Hawks and Martinez to study compression and make adjustments; they used to examine by salary by groups each year and ask for more money in budget. Hawks said he looks in department, which seems insufficient within small departments; Edge says perhaps take three or four departments that are comparable in terms of marketability. Research how stipends for administration duties are affected by gender.

- F. **Additional Items on the Agenda** - We plan to take a closer look at the study Jeff Eisenbarth is going to give us showing an equal percent increase in staff and faculty over the last 13 years. We do not as yet have many other items on the agenda for this year, although we'll talk about this at our meeting next Tuesday, so we welcome suggestions from faculty.

III. Representative from CPS not here because there are not enough faculty. If there is a concern in CPS, Dean Wellman will sit in committee.

IV. Final Details:

- Most of agenda for year is in process. What are our concerns?
  - Continuing concern about administrative bloat – 21.6%, 21.2% according to Jeff Eisenbarth, gauged by the number of positions, not number of salaries. Graph over FTE students indicates the data is 0. Kind of data should be made public; Edge will work with Short and Eisenbarth.
- Get average starting salaries by Department. How to do that? Go to CUPA data. Would we be reporting Rollins starting salaries? There are some inequities within Divisions; could we find groupings of departments, then average of those? Who determines faculty hiring salaries? (Dean, HR, CUPA Data = get median) How much above or below average does Rollins hire? As we've moved to merit, not COLA, we're told what we're budgeted to get. One of our goals this year could be to help the faculty understand the budgeting process more and help administration be more transparent to help faculty understand budgeting. (Note: there is about \$2 million short-fall this year.)
  - Carol Lauer sent out answers responded by Jeff Eisenbarth.
- Has anything changed historically over the past 10 – 15 years? One of the greatest pressures is that students are more interested in services, and that adds pressure. Other schools are building some facilities that are causing facilities creep. Make sure that the old things put in 10 years ago that are now out of favor can be discarded. (Example, got rid of *Tomokan*.)
- Could this committee take on this issue: can the faculty and students take on the issue of figuring out ways the budgeting process could be modified? Edge noted that information gathering is the first step; we have to figure out what information we need. We have to figure out what are the ways faculty can figure out how we can succeed at our efforts at retention. Short: there has to be a two – three year process. Zero-based budgeting is difficult. Higher education is becoming professionalized, so we feel defensive for one's own units; as we become larger, it's harder to feel a common sense for what the goal.

Meeting adjourned 1:50 p.m. Next meeting November 5, 2013.